

73690



PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re U.S. Patent Application

) Art Unit: 1615

Applicant: Edwin H. Christensen

) I hereby certify that this correspondence is  
 ) being deposited with the United Postal  
 ) Service as first class mail in an envelope  
 ) addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of  
 ) Patents, Washington, DC 20231, on  
 ) June 27, 2000

Serial No.: 09/160,618

Filed: September 24, 1998

For: SEMI-MOIST ORAL DELIVERY  
SYSTEM

*Gerald T. Shekleton*  
 ) Gerald T. Shekleton Reg. No. 27,466 Date

Examiner: T. Ware

RESPONSE

Box NON-FEE AMENDMENT  
 Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
 Washington, D.C. 20231

JUL 6 5 2000

TECHNICAL STAMP/2000

Sir:

The communication of June 21, 2000 has indicated that the response filed March 27, 2000 was not fully responsive and required a further response to the double patenting rejection.

Applicant notes that claims 1-8, and 10-22 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 4,284,652. The cited patent is directed to a pet food which, at least in claim 1, is a maintenance pet food. Applicant's claims call for a carrier for an additive. The carrier is not a maintenance pet food, which specifically requires a protein source and thus, being directed to such a maintenance pet food whereas Applicant's invention is directed to a carrier